

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 JESSE OLIVAR,

11 Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-03-0891 GGH PS

12 vs.

13 JOHN E. POTTER,

14 ORDER

15 Defendant.
16 _____/

17 JESSE OLIVAR,

18 Plaintiff,

No. MISC S-04-0379 LKK KJM PS

19 vs.

20 JOHN E. POTTER,

21 ORDER

22 Defendant.
23 _____/

24 JESSE OLIVAR,

25 Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-05-0022 MCE KJM PS

1 vs.

2 JOHN E. POTTER,

3 ORDER

4 Defendant.

5 _____ /
6 JESSE OLIVAR,

7 Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-09-0091 JAM DAD PS

8 vs.

9 JOHN E. POTTER,

10 ORDER

11 Defendant.

12 _____ /
13
14 Examination of the above-entitled actions reveals that assignment of the matters
15 to the same magistrate judge is not likely to effect a substantial saving of judicial effort. See
16 Local Rule 83-123(a). The court therefore declines to relate these actions and reassign them to
17 the same magistrate judge.

18 IT IS SO ORDERED.

19 DATED: May 28, 2009

20
21 /s/ Gregory G. Hollows

22 _____
23 GREGORY G. HOLLOWS
24 U. S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

25 GGH:076/Olivar891.rel.wpd
26